



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,958	05/20/1999	JUNICHI IIDA	P17948	5849
7055	7590	10/07/2004	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			POKRZYWA, JOSEPH R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/314,958	IIDA, JUNICHI
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Joseph R. Pokrzywa	2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 19-24,27-33 and 37-60 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 19-24,27-33 and 37-60 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/1/04.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 6/3/04, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 19-24, 27-33, and 37-60 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-18, filed 6/3/04, with respect to claims 19, 28, 37, and 38, cited in the Office action dated 3/10/04 as being anticipated by Saito *et al.* (EPO Publication Number EP 0 835 011), have been fully considered and are persuasive. The examiner concedes that Saito fails to expressly disclose of generating a communication result file that includes results of e-mail transmission communications performed by the e-mail transmitter. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made, interpreted as being unpatentable over Smith *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 6,385,655) in view of Saito *et al.*, with a full discussion appearing below.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 9/1/04 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 19-24, 27-33, and 37-60** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 6,385,655, cited in the Office action dated 3/10/04) in view of Saito *et al.* (EPO Publication EP 0 835 011, cited in the Office action dated 3/10/04).

Regarding **claim 19**, Smith discloses a communication apparatus (see Fig. 1, server 22) connected to a terminal apparatus (computer 14) via a network (electronic network 18), with the communication apparatus (server 22) comprising an e-mail transmitter that performs an e-mail transmission to a destination (column 5, lines 48 through 61), a file generator that generates a communication result file (see Figs. 10-13, column 13, lines 16 through 31, and column 14, line 35 through column 15, line 32) that includes a result of the e-mail transmission communication performed by the e-mail transmitter (see Figs. 11-13, column 14, line 48 through column 15, line 6), a memory that stores the communication result file as a HTML file (column 2, line 44 through column 3, line 44, and column 10, lines 45 through 59), and a communicator that transmits the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (see Fig. 10, column 13, line 15 through column 14, line 41), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (see Figs. 1, and 10-13).

However, Smith fails to expressly disclose if the communication apparatus further comprises *a control panel configured to at least enter a destination address*, and subsequently having the e-mail transmitter perform e-mail transmission to a destination *in response to an input from the control panel*.

Saito discloses a communication apparatus (see Figs. 1 and 2, netfax 1) connected to a terminal apparatus (reception terminal 3) via a network (network 2), with the communication apparatus (netfax 1) comprising a control panel configured to at least enter a destination address (panel section 15, column 6, lines 19 through 22), an e-mail transmitter that performs an e-mail transmission to a destination in response to an input from the control panel (column 6, lines 45 through 50), a file generator that generates a communication result file (log file having access confirmation information, seen in Fig. 17), a memory that stores the communication result file as a HTML file (see Figs. 16 and 17, column 10, line 54 through column 11, line 22), and a communicator that transmits the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (column 12, line 42 through column 13, line 14), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (column 13, lines 4 through 14).

Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Regarding **claim 20**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 19, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file comprises a plurality of communication results (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding **claim 21**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 19, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file comprises at least one of a communication date and a destination associated with a communication result (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding **claim 22**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 19, and Smith further teaches that the file generator generating a communication result as the HTML file to update the communication result file in the memory when the e-mail transmitter performs an e-mail transmission (column 8, line 62 through column 9, line 7, and column 10, lines 53 through 67, and column 14, line 65 through column 11).

Regarding **claim 23**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 19, and Smith further teaches that the memory stores a main file including a mark indicating a request for the communication result file (tracking button 144, see Figs. 6-10, column 12, line 64 through column 13, line 31), and the communicator transmits the main file to the terminal apparatus in response to actuation of the mark (see Fig. 10-13, column 13, line 16 through column 14, line 41).

Regarding **claim 24**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 23, and Smith further teaches that the request for the communication result file is performed by clicking the mark on the main file at the terminal apparatus (tracking button 144, see Figs. 6-10, column 12, line 64 through column 13, line 31).

Regarding **claim 27**, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 37, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file comprises at least one of a communication date, a destination, a number of sheets, a communication duration time and a charge, associated with a communication result (Figs. 11-13).

Regarding **claim 28**, Smith discloses a method for checking a communication result of a communication apparatus (see Fig. 1, server 22) connected to a terminal apparatus (sending computer 14) via a network (electronic network 18), with the method comprising performing an e-mail transmission to a destination (column 5, lines 48 through 61), generating a communication result file (see Figs. 10-13, column 13, lines 16 through 31, and column 14, line 35 through column 15, line 32) including a result of the e-mail transmission communication performed (see Figs. 11-13, column 14, line 48 through column 15, line 6), storing the communication result file as a HTML file in a memory (column 2, line 44 through column 3, line 44, and column 10, lines 45 through 59), and transmitting the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (see Fig. 10, column 13, line 15 through column 14, line 41), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (see Figs. 1, and 10-13).

However, Smith fails to expressly disclose if the communication apparatus further comprises *a control panel*, with the method comprising *inputting a destination address via the*

*control panel, and subsequently having performing an e-mail transmission to a destination in response to an input from the control panel.*

Saito discloses a method for checking a communication result of a communication apparatus (see Figs. 1 and 2, netfax 1) connected to a terminal apparatus (reception terminal 3) via a network (network 2), with the communication apparatus (netfax 1) including a control panel (see Fig. 2, panel section 15), with the method comprising inputting a destination address via the control panel (column 6, lines 19 through 22), performing an e-mail transmission to a destination in response to an input from the control panel (column 6, lines 45 through 50), generating a communication result file (log file having access confirmation information, seen in Fig. 17), storing the communication result file as a HTML file in a memory (see Figs. 16 and 17, column 10, line 54 through column 11, line 22), and transmitting the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (column 12, line 42 through column 13, line 14), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (column 13, lines 4 through 14).

Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 28.

Regarding ***claim 29***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 28, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file comprises a plurality of communication results (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claim 30***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 28, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file comprises at least one of a communication date and a destination associated with a communication result (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claim 31***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 28, and Smith further teaches of generating a communication result as the HTML file to update the communication result file in the memory when the e-mail transmission is performed (column 8, line 62 through column 9, line 7, and column 10, lines 53 through 67, and column 14, line 65 through column 11).

Regarding ***claim 32***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 28, and Smith further teaches of transmitting a main file, including a mark indicating a request for the communication result file (tracking button 144, see Figs. 6-10, column 12, line 64 through column 13, line 31), to the terminal apparatus before transmitting the communication result file (see Fig. 10-13, column 13, line 16 through column 14, line 41).

Regarding ***claim 33***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 32, and Smith further teaches that the request for the communication result file is performed by clicking the mark on the main file at the terminal apparatus (tracking button 144, see Figs. 6-10, column 12, line 64 through column 13, line 31).

Regarding **claim 37**, Smith discloses a communication apparatus (see Fig. 1, server 22) connected to a terminal apparatus (sending computer 14) via a network (electronic network 18), the communication apparatus (server 22) comprising an e-mail transmitter that performs an e-mail transmission to a destination (column 5, lines 48 through 61), a facsimile transmitter that performs a facsimile transmission to a destination via a telephone network (column 5, lines 48 through 61), a file generator that generates a communication result file (see Figs. 10-13, column 13, lines 16 through 31, and column 14, line 35 through column 15, line 32) that includes a result of the e-mail transmission communication performed by the e-mail transmitter (see Figs. 11-13, column 14, line 48 through column 15, line 6), a determiner that determines whether to perform an e-mail transmission to the destination by the e-mail transmitter or to perform a facsimile transmission to the destination by the facsimile transmitter (column 5, lines 56 through 61, column 7, lines 60 through 67, and column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 15), a memory that stores the communication result file as a HTML file (column 2, line 44 through column 3, line 44, and column 10, lines 45 through 59), and a communicator that transmits the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (see Fig. 10, column 13, line 15 through column 14, line 41), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (see Figs. 1, and 10-13).

However, Smith fails to expressly disclose if the communication apparatus further comprises *a control panel configured to at least enter a destination address*, and subsequently having the e-mail transmitter perform e-mail transmission to a destination *in response to an input from the control panel*.

Saito discloses a communication apparatus (see Figs. 1 and 2, netfax 1) connected to a terminal apparatus (reception terminal 3) via a network (network 2), with the communication apparatus (netfax 1) comprising a control panel configured to input a destination address (panel section 15, column 6, lines 19 through 22), an e-mail transmitter that performs an e-mail transmission to a destination in response to an input from the control panel (column 6, lines 45 through 50), a facsimile transmitter that performs a facsimile transmission to a destination via a telephone network (column 6, lines 5 through 8), a file generator that generates a communication result file (log file having access confirmation information, seen in Fig. 17), a determiner that determines whether to perform an e-mail transmission to the destination by the e-mail transmitter or to perform a facsimile transmission to the destination by the facsimile transmitter (CPU 11, column 6, lines 1 through 28, and column 8, lines 29 through 44, whereby an e-mail transmission would be performed when an e-mail address is input via the panel section 15, or a facsimile transmission would be performed through the public telecommunication network when a telephone number is input via the panel section 15), a memory that stores the communication result file as a HTML file (see Figs. 16 and 17, column 10, line 54 through column 11, line 22), and a communicator that transmits the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (column 12, line 42 through column 13, line 14), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (column 13, lines 4 through 14).

Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

Regarding *claim 38*, Smith discloses a method for checking a communication result of a communication apparatus (see Fig. 1, server 22) connected to a terminal apparatus (sending computer 14) via a network (electronic network 18), the method comprising performing an e-mail transmission to a destination via the network (column 5, lines 48 through 61), performing a facsimile transmission to a destination via a telephone network (column 5, lines 48 through 61), determining whether to perform the e-mail transmission to the destination or to perform a facsimile transmission to the destination (column 5, lines 56 through 61, column 7, lines 60 through 67, and column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 15), generating a communication result file (see Figs. 10-13, column 13, lines 16 through 31, and column 14, line 35 through column 15, line 32) including a result of an e-mail transmission communication performed (see Figs. 11-13, column 14, line 48 through column 15, line 6), storing the communication result file as an HTML file (column 2, line 44 through column 3, line 44, and column 10, lines 45 through 59), and transmitting the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the terminal apparatus (see Fig. 10, column 13, line

15 through column 14, line 41), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (see Figs. 1, and 10-13).

However, Smith fails to expressly disclose if the communication apparatus further comprises *a control panel*, with the method comprising *inputting a destination address via the control panel*, and subsequently having performing an e-mail transmission to a destination *in response to an input from the control panel*.

Saito discloses a method for checking a communication result of a communication apparatus (see Figs. 1 and 2, netfax 1) connected to a terminal apparatus (reception terminal 3) via a network (network 2), with the communication apparatus (netfax 1) including a control panel (see Fig. 2, panel section 15), with the method comprising inputting a destination address via the control panel (column 6, lines 19 through 22), performing an e-mail transmission to a destination in response to an input from the control panel (column 6, lines 45 through 50), performing a facsimile transmission to a destination via a telephone network (column 6, lines 5 through 8), determining whether to perform the e-mail transmission to the destination or to perform a facsimile transmission to the destination (column 6, lines 1 through 28, and column 8, lines 29 through 44, whereby an e-mail transmission would be performed when an e-mail address is input via the panel section 15, or a facsimile transmission would be performed through the public telecommunication network when a telephone number is input via the panel section 15), generating a communication result file (log file having access confirmation information, seen in Fig. 17), storing the communication result file as an HTML file (see Figs. 16 and 17, column 10, line 54 through column 11, line 22), and transmitting the communication result file to the terminal apparatus when a request for the communication result file is received from the

terminal apparatus (column 12, line 42 through column 13, line 14), the communication result file being displayable at the terminal apparatus (column 13, lines 4 through 14).

Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Regarding ***claims 39 and 40***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 19, and Saito further teaches of an input device configured to input image data to the communication apparatus (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28), the input device connected to the communication apparatus independently of the network (see Fig. 2, column 6, lines 22 through 28). Saito further teaches that the input device comprises a scanner (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28).

As discussed above, Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the further teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel and scanner of a facsimile device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claims 39 and 40.

Regarding **claims 41 and 42**, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 28, and Saito further teaches of inputting image data to the communication apparatus by an input device (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28) connected to the communication apparatus independently of the network (see Fig. 2, column 6, lines 22 through 28). Saito further teaches that the inputting comprises a scanning (through scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28).

As discussed above, Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the further teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel and scanner of a facsimile device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claims 41 and 42.

Regarding ***claims 43 and 44***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 37, and Saito further teaches of an input device configured to input image data to the communication apparatus (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28), the input device connected to the communication apparatus independently of the network (see Fig. 2, column 6, lines 22 through 28). Saito further teaches that the input device comprises a scanner (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28).

As discussed above, Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the further teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel and scanner of a facsimile device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claims 43 and 44.

Regarding ***claims 45 and 46***, Smith and Saito disclose the method discussed above in claim 38, and Saito further teaches of inputting image data to the communication apparatus via an input device (scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28)

connected to the communication apparatus independently of the network and of the telephone network (see Fig. 2, column 6, lines 22 through 28). Saito further teaches that the inputting comprises a scanning (through scanner section 16, see Fig. 2, column 5, line 38 through column 6, line 28).

As discussed above, Smith & Saito are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that transmit electronic mail and create a file in a HTML format.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the further teachings of Saito in the server of Smith, since Saito's facsimile apparatus (netfax 1) has an internal server mechanism, thus can be considered a server.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the server taught by Smith would become more user-friendly, since a user would be capable of manipulating data through a control panel and scanner of a facsimile device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Saito with the system of Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claims 45 and 46.

Regarding ***claims 47 and 49***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatuses discussed above in claims 19 and 37, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file includes the result of a previously performed e-mail transmission (see Fig. 13).

Regarding ***claims 48 and 50***, Smith and Saito disclose the methods discussed above in claims 19 and 38, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file includes the result of a previously performed e-mail transmission (see Fig. 13).

Regarding ***claims 51 and 53***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatuses discussed above in claims 19 and 37, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file

including information relating to a time of transmission and a transmission type (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claims 52 and 54***, Smith and Saito disclose the methods discussed above in claims 28 and 38, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file including information relating to a time of transmission and a transmission type (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claims 55 and 57***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatuses discussed above in claims 19 and 37, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file being configured for transmission to the terminal apparatus independently of the transmission of the e-mail to the destination address (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claims 56 and 58***, Smith and Saito disclose the methods discussed above in claims 28 and 38, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the communication result file being configured for transmission to the terminal apparatus independently of the transmission of the e-mail to the destination address (see Figs. 11-13).

Regarding ***claims 59 and 60***, Smith and Saito disclose the apparatus and method discussed above in claims 37 and 38, respectively, and Smith further teaches that the memory stores a main file including a mark indicating a request for the communication result file (tracking button 144, see Figs. 6-10, column 12, line 64 through column 13, line 31), and the communicator transmits the main file to the terminal apparatus in response to actuation of the mark (see Fig. 10-13, column 13, line 16 through column 14, line 41).

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joe Pokrzywa whose telephone number is (703) 305-0146. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph R. Pokrzywa  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

jrp

